REMARKS

With this Response, Applicants respectfully request that claims 2-3 and 11-12 be canceled without prejudice. Claims 4-6, 9, and 13 are amended to correct dependency issues arising from the canceling of claims 2-3 and 11-12. Furthermore, claims 1 and 10 are substantively amended, and claim 16 is amended to address an informality. Claims 20-21 are newly presented herein to claim subject matter described, for example, in Figure 8 and the accompanying description, while claim 22 is added herein to claim subject matter similar to that recited in claim 4. Therefore, claims 1, 4-10, and 13-21 are pending.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 10 and 16 were objected for alleged informalities. Appropriate correction is made herein, as indicated in the Claim Listing above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 5-19

Claims 1-3 and 5-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2002/0191588 of Personick (hereinafter "Personick"). Claims 2-3 and 11-12 are canceled herein, rendering rejection of these claims moot. The remaining claims are not anticipated by the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims from which the remaining pending claims depend, as well as new claims 20-22 added herein. Both claims 1 and 10 as amended herein recite features directed to a **timeslot-reservation table** for TDM traffic and **prescheduling switching** of a packet-switched fabric that switches TDM and packet-based traffic by entries in the table.

The Office Action appears to rely on the mention of a "database" in the cited reference as disclosing Applicants' claimed table. The cited reference does not support such an interpretation, and teaches opposite to what is recited in Applicants' claims. The only mention of the "database" is passing reference in paragraphs [0030] and [0031], which state:

> [C]ircuit switched circuits for transporting the circuit switched packets
> through the integrated switching network 10 are formed by a network controller
> 30 (see FIG. 1) reserving a quantity of the time slots in each of the TDM

communication links 24 to each of the circuits. The network controller 30 **maintains a database containing the quantity of the time slots which are reserved for each of the circuit switched circuits** on each of the TDM communication links 24...,

and,

When the network controller 30 receives a circuit request, including the required value of the throughput, from the input transitional switch 26a, the network controller 30 converts the value of the throughput to an equivalent number of slots per cycle on each of the TDM communication links 24. The network controller 30 then **examines the database in the network controller 30 for the TDM communication links 24 that can provide the required number of the time slots per cycle...**,

respectively. Thus, the database appears to do nothing more than store a value associated with each circuit switched circuit to identify how many timeslots would be needed by the particular circuit switched circuit. The database is not expressly disclosed to be a timeslot reservation table, nor is it possible to interpret the database of Personick as inherently being such a table. In fact, a database need not even be a table. Consider the requirements for inherency in MPEP § 2112, which require the interpretation to **necessarily flow** from the disclosure. Such is not the case here.

In contrast to what is discussed in Personick, Applicants' independent claims recite a **timeslot-reservation table** for TDM traffic and **prescheduling switching** of a packet-switched fabric that switches TDM and packet-based traffic by entries in the table. Not only does the cited reference fail to disclose a table as claimed, but the idea of prescheduling is completely incompatible with the system described in Personick. Paragraph [0037] of the reference expressly states "The time divided-space switch 45 in each core switch is **controlled by a time slot scheduler 48**." See also paragraphs [0038] and [0039]. The reference appears to require the use of a scheduler, which is in contrast to the prescheduling provided by the timeslot reservation table as recited in Applicants' claims. Consider, for example, paragraph [0022] of Applicants Specification for additional explanation.

Thus, Applicants submit that the invention as recited in the independent claims includes features not disclosed or suggested in the cited reference, and which are contrary to the operation of the cited reference. Therefore, the cited reference fails to support an anticipation rejection of the independent claims. The independent claims are therefore patentable over the cited reference,

and the dependent claims are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

Claim 4

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2002/0191588 of Personick (hereinafter "Personick") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,650 of McCrosky (hereinafter "McCrosky"). This rejection is based on the assumption that Personick discloses all features of the claims except the specific Slepian-Duguid-based algorithm, for which McCrosky is cited as showing. Whether or not McCrosky discloses the algorithm for which it is cited, McCrosky is not cited as curing, and Applicants do not understand it to cure, the deficiencies of Personick as set forth above. Whether alone or in combination, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least one feature of the invention as recited in the independent claims, as set forth above. Thus, the independent claims are not rendered obvious by the cited references. As a dependent claim, claim 4 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons set forth above for the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections are overcome, and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn. Therefore, all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: June 5, 2008

/Vincent H. Anderson/
Vincent H. Anderson
Reg. No. 54,962
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: June 5, 2008   /Katherine Jennings/
Katherine Jennings